

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandris, Vignia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/497,176	02/03/2000	Pierre Ardaud	022701-863	7179
21839 7	7590 06/13/2003			
BURNS DOANE SWECKER & MATHIS L L P			EXAMINER	
• •	POST OFFICE BOX 1404 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404 SERGENT, RABON A			RABON A
ALLAMITUM	11, 171 22515-1404			
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1711	13
			DATE MAILED: 06/13/2003	` /

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	. 1		→
		Application No.	Applicant(s)
		09/497,176	ARDAUD ET AL.
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
		Rabon Sergent	1711
	- The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover shee	t with the correspondence address
Period fo	r Reply		
THE M - Exten after: - If the - If NO - Failui	DRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. sions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period to to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing d patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may within the statutory minimum of will apply and will expire SIX (6) as cause the application to become	by a reply be timely filed If thirty (30) days will be considered timely. MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BARANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15.	April <u>2003</u> .	
2a)□	·	nis action is non-final.	
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allow	ance except for formal	matters, prosecution as to the merits is
ŕ	closed in accordance with the practice under on of Claims	Ex parte Quayle, 1935	5 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.
•	Claim(s) 1-51 is/are pending in the application	n.	
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra		
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
	Claim(s) <u>1-51</u> is/are rejected.		
-	Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	or election requiremen	t.
	ion Papers		
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examin	er.	
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce	epted or b) objected to	by the Examiner.
	Applicant may not request that any objection to t	he drawing(s) be held in a	abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
11)□	The proposed drawing correction filed on		│ disapproved by the Examiner.
	If approved, corrected drawings are required in r		
12)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	xaminer.	
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		_
13)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	gn priority under 35 U.S	S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:		
	1. Certified copies of the priority document		
	2. Certified copies of the priority docume	nts have been received	in Application No
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri application from the International E See the attached detailed Office action for a list	Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2 st of the certified copie	(a)). s not received.
14)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for dome	stic priority under 35 U	S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
1	a) The translation of the foreign language packnowledgment is made of a claim for dome	rovisional application I	nas been received.
Attachme			
1) No	tice of References Cited (PTO-892) tice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) ormation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s	5) 🔲 No	erview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) tice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) ter: .

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-326 (Rev. 04-01) Application/Control Number: 09/497,176 Page 2

Art Unit: 1711

- 1. Claims 1-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Throughout prosecution, based on the disclosure, the examiner has interpreted the language, "... having a degree of liberation with respect to the masking agent at 120°C of 5% or less", to mean that 5% or less of the masked isocyanate groups deblock at 120°C. This interpretation is logical, since one would expect that the reference to liberation means freeing the masked isocyanate groups. However, applicants have, by their response of April 15, 2003, cast uncertainty on the meaning of the language. Applicants have stated at page 4 of the response that the aforementioned language means that at 120°C no more than 5% of the isocyanate functions remain masked. Applicants' interpretation is completely opposite what one of ordinary skill would interpret the language to actually mean. Since this language is crucial to the definition of the invention and since two opposite interpretations have been set forth with respect to the meaning of the language, the position is taken that the invention has not been adequately described.
- 2. Claims 1-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. In view of the position taken with respect to the "degree of liberation" within paragraph 1, the position is taken that the invention has not been adequately enabled. Since it

Application/Control Number: 09/497,176 Page 3

Art Unit: 1711

cannot be determined with certainly what characteristics the masked isocyanate is to have, the position is taken that one of ordinary skill could not determine what combinations of isocyanates and masking agents are suitable; therefore, one of ordinary skill could not practice the invention.

3. Claims 1-24 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Within claims 1 and 51, it is unclear if the percent value for the degree of liberation is a mole or weight percent. Furthermore, the basis of the percent is unclear. It is not seen that applicants' response has clarified the issue with respect to the type and basis of the percent.

4. Claims 25-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for high gloss yielding compositions which are derived from masked isocyanates having a degree of liberation with respect to the masking agent at 120°C of 5% or less, does not reasonably provide enablement for high gloss coating compositions that lack the aforementioned masked isocyanate feature. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. The examiner has considered applicants' response and disclosure, and the rejection has been modified accordingly. The position is maintained that applicants have failed to provide adequate enablement for the production of viable compositions when the compositions are not governed by the aforementioned masked

Application/Control Number: 09/497,176

Page 4

Art Unit: 1711

isocyanate feature. This degree of liberation characteristic appears to be central to the disclosed invention and the position is taken that the claims should be so limited.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to R. Sergent at telephone number (703) 308-2982.

R. Sergent June 11, 2003 RABON SERGENT